



Zoning Bylaw Working Group

Date: September 19, 2019

Time: 8:30 AM to 9:30 AM

Location: Town Hall Annex, Second Floor Conference Room

Minutes

Present: Pam Heidell, Charlie Kalauskas, Christian Klein, Jenny Raitt, Stephen Revilak, Ralph Willmer, Erin Zwirko.

Absent: Mike Byrne, Adam Chapdelaine, David Watson, John Worden.

Guests: Jo Anne Preston, Don Seltzer, Patricia Worden.

The first item on the agenda was to review the responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for an Economic Analysis of the Industrial Zoning Districts. The Town received 5 responses: VHB, RKG, Horsley Witten, Barrett Planning Group, and Community Opportunities Group. Each firm engaged with a sub-consultant as well. The members decided to discuss together each consultant's response during the meeting.

VHB submitted a proposal with Landwise. The members provided the following feedback:

- The proposal did not have many specifics.
- The staffing was good, although the PM didn't seem to have relevant experience and there was concern that the ZBWG and staff would have to educate the consultant along the way.
- The sub-consultant seemed good, but it is a relatively new spin off from Sasaki Associates.
- There is familiarity with the town, but not necessarily relevant projects.
- The scope of work seemed to have an environmental focus, which was not the focus of the RFP.

RKG submitted a proposal with Harimann. The members provided the following feedback:

- The PM is familiar with the town.
- The scope of work had the longest timeline than any of the proposals. The members suggested that if the consultant was chosen, the timeline should be tightened.
- The proposer is capable of completing the work.

- There were no dates included with the relevant experience.
- The proposer was involved with the recodification project, and there was concern that the proposer would not be able to maintain the schedule. The members discussed why the schedule for the recodification project became lengthened.

Horsley Witten Group submitted a proposal with Camion. The members provided the following feedback:

- The work plan seemed to be at odds with the RFP's scope of work. It stressed public participation, only included two scenario plans, and included a build out analysis, which was not called for in the RFP.
- The project description was too vague and it was not clear who from the team would be doing which tasks.
- The members think of Horsley Witten as an environmental science firm, but there is staff with a strong zoning background and the firm has worked on land use and zoning projects.

Barrett Planning Group submitted a proposal with FXM Associates. The members provided the following feedback:

- There was some surprise in receiving a response from this firm, although FXM is highly qualified.
- The firm is relatively small and new staff. The members questioned the depth of resources, the staffing plan, and how involved the principal would be in the project.
- It would be worth hearing from the references.

Community Opportunities Group submitted a proposal with Lisa Davis Associates. The members provided the following feedback:

- There was a good breadth of work for municipalities and private firms. However, the projects highlighted were less relevant and none were focused on industrial zoning or economic analyses.
- There was a reasonable approach. The firm did their homework before submitting. Conversely, a comment was made that the scope was lacking.
- The staff qualifications seemed good.
- The PM's resume was not detailed, so the members wondered her role and the role of the advisor.

After discussing the individual proposals, there was a discussion of where to go from here. The members thought that RKG's proposal rose to the top, but there were no other clear standouts. It would be ideal to interview 3 firms and the sub-consultants. There was much discussion about the rating forms as two of the criteria refer to client references. Erin agreed to contact the references for all of the firms by September 25, using the criteria in the RFP to formulate questions and to gain additional insight, and get that information back out to the members at that time. The ZBWG members would then complete their rating forms and return them to Erin before September 27.

There was some discussion on whether the interviews should take place on October 2 during the regularly scheduled ZBWG meeting. Steve, Charlie, and Ralph indicated their interest in participating in the interviews, but Ralph could not be available on October 2.

The members discussed the minutes from August 7, 2019. John had provided feedback on the minutes over email, which Erin added to the minutes for review. She had emailed the revised minutes out to the membership prior to the meeting and did not receive any further feedback. She also provided a hardcopy version of the revised minutes to Mrs. Worden, who was attending the meeting. The members present agreed that the revised minutes were reflective of the discussion in August. The members did not vote to approve the minutes since the wrong quorum of members were present, but allowed Erin to post the minutes as draft to the website. A formal vote was deferred to the next meeting.

Jenny provided a quick update on zoning amendments that the ZBWG would likely review for Annual Town Meeting in spring 2020. The town is working on developing amendments to the Town Bylaw and the Zoning Bylaw to be consistent with the Municipal Small Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements. Potential amendments would be forthcoming this fall.

The Working Group meets next on October 2, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 AM.